

**REMARKS**

This communication is a full and timely response to the final Office Action dated June 3, 2005 (Paper No./Mail Date 05192005). By this communication, claims 11 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of the underlying subject matter, claims 2, 4, 5, and 7 have been amended, and claims 12-14 have been added.

Claim 2 has been amended to recite that the vibration-suppressing member is an oil damper having a base portion in which an oil is charged and a rotating portion having a gear which is in contact with the input-side gear, and a rotating force of the rotating portion is moderate by the oil charged in the base portion. Support for the subject matter recited in claim 2 can be found variously throughout the specification, for example, at paragraphs [0143] – [0147] of corresponding U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004-0222760. No new matter has been added.

Claim 4 has been amended to recite that the stop control of the motor stop control means comprises a first stop control for reducing the rotating speed of the motor by transmitting pulses for causing two-phase excitation for a first predetermined time. Support for the changes to claim 4 can be found variously throughout the specification and claims, for example, at paragraphs [0090] – [0093] of corresponding U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004-0222760. No new matter has been added.

Claim 5 has been amended to recite that the stop control of the motor stop control means comprises a second stop control through two-phase excitation for a second predetermined time after performing the first stop control. Support for the changes to claim 5 can be found variously throughout the specification and claims, for example, at paragraphs [0105] – [0109] of corresponding U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004-0222760. No new matter has been added.

Claim 7 has been placed into independent form by explicitly reciting the elements of canceled claim 2. No new matter has been added.

Claim 12 recites that the stop control is performed in parallel with a vibration-suppressing effect by the vibration-suppressing member. Support for the subject matter recited in claim 12 can be found variously throughout the specification, for example, at paragraph [0135] of corresponding U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004-0222760. No new matter has been added.

Claim 13 recites that the speed reduction ratio is determined by a ratio between a number of steps of one rotation of the motor, and the least common multiple calculated from a number of the symbols drawn on the reel and the number of steps of the motor. Support for the subject matter recited in claim 13 can be found variously throughout the specification, for example, in original claim 2. No new matter has been added.

Claim 14 recites that the motor stop control means for performs stop control of the motor through two-phase excitation after performing a control for reducing the rotating speed of the motor based on a stop command for the motor. Support for the subject matter recited in claim 14 can be found variously throughout the specification, for example, in original claim 2. No new matter has been added.

Entry of this Amendment is proper under 37 C.F.R. §1.116 since the amendment: (a) places the application in condition for allowance (for the reasons discussed herein); (b) does not raise any new issues requiring further search and/or consideration; (c) satisfies a requirement of form asserted in the previous Office Action; and (d) places the application in better form for appeal, should an appeal be necessary. The amendment is necessary and was not earlier presented because it is made in response to arguments raised in the final rejection. Entry of this amendment is respectfully requested. Reexamination and reconsideration in light of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 2, 4-10, and 12-14 are pending where claims 2 and 7 are independent.

### **Allowable Subject Matter**

Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating that claim 7 contains allowable subject. As discussed in detail below, Applicant has placed claim 7 into independent form and amended claim 2 to include the allowable subject matter of claim 7. For at least this reason, claims 2, 4-10, and 12-14 are allowable.

### **Claim Objections**

Claims 4-6 were objected to for alleged informalities. Claims 4 and 5 have been amended to address and remedy the alleged informalities. Regarding claim 6, the Office Action alleges that the recited “oil dumper” should instead be “oil damper.” Applicant respectfully submits, however, that “oil dumper” is not recited in claim 6, but is recited in claim 7.

Accordingly, claim 7 has been amended to recite “oil damper.” For at least this reason, Applicant respectfully requests that the objection to claims 4-6 be withdrawn.

**Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 2, 4, and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over *Watanabe et al.*—JP 2003-117076 in view of *Inoue*—U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004-0018869, *Yamamoto*—U.S. Patent No. 4,765,078, and *Murakami*—JP 09327553. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 2 has been amended to incorporate the allowable subject matter recited in claim 7. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. §103 be withdrawn and this claim be allowed.

Claims 4 and 5 depend from claim 2. By virtue of this dependency, Applicant submits that claims 4 and 5 are allowable for at least the same reasons given above with respect to claim 2. In addition, Applicant submits that claims 4 and 5 are further distinguished over *Watanabe*, *Inoue*, *Yamamoto*, and *Murakami* by the additional elements recited therein, and particularly with respect to each claimed combination. Applicant respectfully requests, therefore, that the rejection of claims 4 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. §103 be withdrawn, and these claims be allowed.

Claims 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over *Inoue* in view of *Watanabe*, *Murakami*, and *Dickinson et al.*—U.S. Patent No. 4,711,452 or *Tamura et al.*—U.S. Patent No. 4,625,931. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 2 has been amended to incorporate the allowable subject matter recited in claim 7. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. §103 be withdrawn and this claim be allowed.

Claims 4-6 and 8-10 depend from claim 2. By virtue of this dependency, Applicant submits that claims these claims are allowable for at least the same reasons given above with respect to claim 2. In addition, Applicant submits that claims 4-6 and 8-10 are further distinguished over *Watanabe*, *Inoue*, *Murakami*, and *Dickinson* or *Tamura* by the additional elements recited therein, and particularly with respect to each claimed combination. Applicant respectfully requests, therefore, that the rejection of claims 4-6 and 8-10 under 35 U.S.C. §103 be withdrawn, and these claims be allowed.

Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over *Watanabe* in view of *Inoue* and *Murakami*. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

As discussed above, claim 11 was canceled without prejudice. For at least this reason, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of claim 11 is moot. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection to claim 11 be withdrawn.

**Newly Added Claims**

Claims 12-14 depend from claim 2. By virtue of this dependency, Applicant submits that claims 12-14 are allowable for at least the same reasons given above with respect to claim 2. In addition, Applicant submits that claims 12-14 are further distinguished over prior art of record by the additional elements recited therein, and particularly with respect to each claimed combination. Applicant respectfully requests, therefore, that claims 12-14 be examined and allowed.

**Conclusion**

Based on at least the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that claims 2, 4-10, and 12-14 are allowable, and this application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants request favorable reexamination and reconsideration of the application. In the event the Examiner has any comments or suggestions for placing the application in even better form, Applicants request that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney at the number listed below.

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 18-0013, under Order No. SHO-0053 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated:

*August 3, 2005*

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Shawn B. Cage

Registration No.: 51,522  
Attorney for Applicant

**RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER, PLLC**  
Lion Building  
1233 20<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W., Suite 501  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
Tel: (202) 955-3750  
Fax: (202) 955-3751  
Customer No. 23353

DC199496